

THE EFFECTIVE SPIN HAMILTONIAN AND PHASE SEPARATION INSTABILITY OF THE ALMOST HALF-FILLED HUBBARD MODEL AND NARROW-BAND s - f MODEL

M.I. Auslender and M.I. Katsnelson

Institute for Metal Physics, Ural Scientific Centre, Sverdlovsk, U.S.S.R.

(Received 1 April 1982 by B. Muhlschlegel)

Abstract

The effective spin Hamiltonian is constructed in the framework of the almost half-filled Hubbard model on the Cayley tree by means of functional integral technique with the use of static approximation. The system in the ground state appears to be consisting of the ferromagnetic metallic domains and the antiferromagnetic insulating one sprovided that the concentration of excess electrons (or holes) does not exceed some critical value. The connection between the Hubbard model and the s - f model is stated.

TO DESCRIBE the narrow-band magnetic semiconductors, one uses in general two models: (1) the Hubbard model with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_H = \sum_{ij\sigma} (t_{ij} - \mu\delta_{ij}) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + u \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} \quad (1)$$

where $c_{i\sigma}^\dagger$, $c_{i\sigma}$ are the creation and annihilation electron operators on the site i with the spin projection σ , $n_{i\sigma} = c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma}$, μ is the chemical potential, $u \gg |t_{ij}|$, an average number of electrons per site $N_e/N = 1 + c$ ($c > 0$) being close to unity; and (2) the s - f model

$$\mathcal{H}_{s-f} = \sum_{ij\sigma} (t_{ij} - \mu\delta_{ij}) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} - I \sum_{i\sigma\sigma'} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot c_{i\sigma}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{i\sigma'} + \mathcal{H}_f \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_i$ is the f -spin operator, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the Pauli matrices, $\mathcal{H}_f$ is the Hamiltonian of direct f -spin interactions, I is the exchange parameter, $|I| \gg |t_{ij}|$, $N_e/N \ll 1$. The first model describes the situation when the conduction electrons belong to the same band as the electrons forming the localized moments. On the other hand the Hamiltonian (2) is applied when these electrons are in the different bands (s and f). Nevertheless the models (1) and (2) are equivalent under certain approximations as it will be proved further (Nagaev was the first who emphasized this feature [1]). Therefore we restrict ourselves to consideration of the Hubbard model.

When both c and $|t_{ij}|/u$ are small the competition of tendencies to ferro- and antiferromagnetic orderings takes place [2, 3, 4] which leads to the phase separation instability [3, 4]. So far this effect has been treated qualitatively (see also [1, 5]). We shall construct here the effective spin Hamiltonian for the systems under consideration which will give the possibility to describe this instability as the first-order phase transition.

We proceed with the representation of the Hubbard model partition function Z in terms of the functional integral over the fluctuating vector fields $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)\}$ conju-

gated to the spin density (see reviews [6, 7]):

$$Z = \int \prod_i \mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau) \exp \left[-\frac{3}{2u} \int_0^\beta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^2(\tau) d\tau \right] Q\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)\} \quad (3)$$

where $\beta^{-1} = T$ is the temperature ($\hbar = 1$, $k = 1$), $Q\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)\}$ is the partition function of free electrons in the external magnetic field $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)$. Then we use a common "static approximation" [6, 7], i.e. we replace $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)$ by its mean value over $(0, \beta)$ - $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$. At $t_{ij} = 0$, $Q\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i(\tau)\}$ can be calculated exactly. Considering formally the band energy term in equation (1) as a perturbation we get

$$Z = \left(\frac{6\beta}{\pi u} \right)^{3N/2} \exp(N\beta\tilde{\mu}) \int \prod_i d\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \exp[-(3\beta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^2/2u)] \times [\cosh(\beta\tilde{\mu}) + \cosh(\beta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i)] \exp(-\beta\Phi\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j\}), \quad (4)$$

$$\Phi\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j\} = -T \text{Tr} \ln(I - tG),$$

where $\tilde{\mu} = \mu - u/2$, t , G are the operators with matrix elements:

$$t_{ij}^{\sigma\sigma'}(\tau, \tau') = t_{ij} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \delta(\tau - \tau'); \\ G_{ij}^{\sigma\sigma'}(\tau, \tau') = \delta_{ij} T \sum_n G_j^{\sigma\sigma'}(i\omega_n) e^{-i\omega_n(\tau - \tau')}$$

respectively, $\omega_n = \pi T(2n + 1)$, $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$,

$$G_j^{\sigma\sigma'}(i\omega_n) = (i\omega_n + \tilde{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{\sigma\sigma'}^{-1} \\ = \frac{i\omega_n + \tilde{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sigma\sigma'}}{(i\omega_n + \tilde{\mu})^2 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j^2} \quad (5)$$

is the Green function of zeroth order approximation in t_{ij} . $\Phi \equiv \Phi\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j\}$ is the functional of the spin interaction energy. When calculating the integral over the modulus of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$, we can apply the saddle point method since $u \gg T$, $|t_{ij}|$: $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \simeq \epsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_j$ ($\epsilon_0 = u/3$, $|\mathbf{n}_j| = 1$). Then Φ appears to be the functional only of unit vectors $\mathbf{n}_j$. The formal perturbation expansion of $\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\}$ with respect to t_{ij} may be obtained in the usual way. It turns out that the true parameter of the expansion is $|t_{ij}| / |\epsilon_0 - \tilde{\mu}|$. It is of order

of $|t_{ij}|/\epsilon_0 \ll 1$ at $c = 0$. But if c is small but finite, $c \gg \exp(-\beta\epsilon_0)$, we have $\tilde{\mu} = \epsilon_0 + T \ln c/(1-c)$ in the zeroth order approximation with respect to t_{ij} , and therefore the perturbation expansion fails. In the case of $c \neq 0$ we use the representation of functional $\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\}$ through the exact Green function $\mathcal{G}_{ij}(\omega|\lambda)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega f(\omega - \tilde{\mu}) \sum_i \text{Im} \Lambda_i(\omega^+), \quad \omega^+ = \omega + i0, \\ \Lambda_i(\omega) &= \text{Tr}_\sigma \int_0^1 d\lambda \sum_j t_{ij} \mathcal{G}_{ij}(\omega|\lambda) = \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \text{Tr}_\sigma [(\omega - \epsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \mathcal{G}_{ii}(\omega|\lambda) - 1],\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

in which $f(x) = (\exp \beta x + 1)^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{ij}(\omega|\lambda)$ satisfies the following equation

$$(\omega - \epsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \mathcal{G}_{ij}(\omega|\lambda) - \sum_{j'} \lambda t_{ij'} \mathcal{G}_{j'j}(\omega|\lambda) = \delta_{ij}. \quad (7)$$

For the s - f model with classical f -spins $\mathbf{S}_j = S \mathbf{n}_j$ there is the correspondence with equations (6) and (7) if one replaces $\epsilon_0 \rightarrow |I|S$. This proves rigorously the equivalence of the narrow-band Hubbard model in the static approximation to the s - f model with classical f -spins and $\mathcal{H}_f = 0$.

Because the equation (6) contains the diagonal Green functions only we try to derive a closed equation for it. It is convenient to introduce the locator self-energy $\mathcal{L}_i(\omega|\lambda)$ by the relation

$$\mathcal{G}_{ii}^{-1}(\omega|\lambda) = \omega - \epsilon_0 \mathbf{n}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} - \mathcal{L}_i(\omega|\lambda) \quad (8)$$

The following expression for $\mathcal{L}_i(\omega|\lambda)$ was proposed in [8] (for the case of electrons moving in disordered media)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_i(\omega|\lambda) &= \lambda^2 \sum_j |t_{ij}|^2 \mathcal{G}_{jj}(\omega|\lambda) = \\ &= (\lambda t)^2 \sum_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathcal{G}_{i+\boldsymbol{\delta}, i+\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\omega|\lambda)\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ labels the nearest neighbours (the nearest neighbour approximation is assumed for t_{ij}). Equation (9) can be obtained from the second-order term of the perturbation theory for $\mathcal{L}_i(\omega|\lambda)$ by replacing $G_j(\omega|\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{jj}(\omega|\lambda)$. It turns out to be exact on the Cayley tree [8]. Both in the ferromagnetic (FM) and the anti-ferromagnetic (AFM) cases $\mathbf{n}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}_{i+\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ does not depend on i . Therefore we assume that the function $\cos \theta_i = (1/z) \sum_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \mathbf{n}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}_{i+\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ (z is the coordination number) is a smooth function of site i . In this approximation and on account that $|t|/\epsilon_0 \ll 1$ the matrix equation (9) can

be solved. The solution to equation (9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_i(\omega) &= 2 \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} [(\omega^2 - \epsilon_0^2) X_i(\omega|\lambda) - 1] \\ X_i(\omega|\lambda) &= 2 \left\{ \omega^2 - \epsilon_0^2 + [(\omega^2 - \epsilon_0^2)^2 - 8z(\lambda t)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times (\omega^2 + \epsilon_0^2 \cos \theta_i)]^{1/2} \right\}^{-1}\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

(the branch of square root is chosen by the condition $X_i(\omega|\lambda) \rightarrow (\omega^2 - \epsilon_0^2)^{-1}$ at $t \rightarrow 0$). Substituting equation (10) to equation (6), taking into account the smallness of c , $|t|/\epsilon_0$ and integrating over λ and ω we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\} &\simeq \frac{zt^2}{2\epsilon_0} \sum_i \cos \theta_i - \frac{8\sqrt{z}|t|}{15\pi} \sum_i \cos \frac{\theta_i}{2} \Theta(\tilde{\mu} - E_i) \\ &\times \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu} - E_i}{\sqrt{z}|t| \cos \frac{\theta_i}{2}} \right)^{5/2} + \text{const}; \\ \Theta(x) &= \begin{cases} 1, & x > 0, \\ 0, & x < 0, \end{cases}\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where

$$E_i = \epsilon_0 - 2\sqrt{z}|t| \cos \frac{\theta_i}{2} + \frac{zt^2}{\epsilon_0} (1 - \cos \theta_i). \quad (12)$$

$\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\}$ is desired free energy functional. It is necessary to write down the equation for the shifted chemical potential $\tilde{\mu}$ in addition to equations (11) and (12). It reads

$$\begin{aligned}c &= \langle c\{\mathbf{n}_j\} \rangle_\Phi, \quad c\{\mathbf{n}_j\} = \frac{4}{3\pi N} \sum_i \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu} - E_i}{\sqrt{z}|t| \cos \frac{\theta_i}{2}} \right)^{3/2} \\ &\times \Theta(\tilde{\mu} - E_i); \\ \langle A\{\mathbf{n}_j\} \rangle_\Phi &= \frac{\int \prod_i d\mathbf{n}_i A\{\mathbf{n}_j\} \exp(-\beta\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\})}{\int \prod_i d\mathbf{n}_j \exp(-\beta\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\})}\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

At $T = 0$ the total energy of the system $E = -T \ln Z + \tilde{\mu} N_e$ equals $E = \min(\Phi\{\mathbf{n}_j\} + N c \tilde{\mu}\{\mathbf{n}_j\})$, $\tilde{\mu}\{\mathbf{n}_j\}$ being the chemical potential for the fixed spin configuration when $c \rightarrow c\{\mathbf{n}_j\}$.

We minimize the energy putting $\cos \frac{\theta_i}{2} = 1$ in the domain of relative volume x (FM phase) and $\cos \frac{\theta_i}{2} = 0$ in the domain of relative volume $1 - x$ (AFM phase). The optimal value of x is $x_0 = c/c_0$,

$$c_0 = \left[\frac{5}{2} \left(\frac{4}{3\pi} \right)^{2/3} \frac{\sqrt{z}|t|}{\epsilon_0} \right]^{3/5}. \quad (14)$$

At $c < c_0$ the two-phase state obtained has the energy which is lower than that of any homogeneous state. Apart from numerical factors, equation (14) agrees with the result of the qualitative consideration [4]. It can be seen from equation (13) that all excess electrons are in

FM domains. At $c > c_0$ the homogeneous FM ordering is favourable. Our Hamiltonian reduces to double-exchange Hamiltonian derived earlier in s - f exchange model (see, e.g. [9]) provided that $c_0 \ll c \ll 1$. It is worthwhile to mention that the Cayley tree approximation gives the right value for the AFM indirect exchange parameter but overestimates the energy of FM ordering in $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{z}$ times.

The contribution of space derivatives of the function $\cos\theta_i$ to the free energy functional has been calculated also. It appears that the thickness of the boundary between FM and AFM phases is of order of lattice constant. This matter will be published elsewhere.

-
- [2] Y. Nagaoka, *Phys. Rev.* **147**, 392 (1966).
 - [3] W.F. Brinkman & T.M. Rice, *Phys. Rev.* **B2**, 1324 (1970).
 - [4] P.B. Visscher, *Phys. Rev.* **B10**, 943 (1974).
 - [5] N.F. Mott, *Metal-Insulator Transitions*, Taylor & Francis, London (1974).
 - [6] T. Moriya, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **14**, 1 (1979).
 - [7] G. Morandi, E. Galleani d'Agliano, F. Napoli & C.F. Ratto, *Adv. Phys.* **23**, 867 (1974).
 - [8] R. Abou-Chakra, P.W. Anderson & D.J. Thouless, *J. Phys.* **C6**, 1734 (1973).
 - [9] P.W. Anderson, *Solid State Physics*, Vol. 14, p. 99. Academic Press, New York (1963).

-
- [1] E.L. Nagaev, *Fizika magnitnikh poluprovodnikov*, Nauka, Moscow, (1979).